



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,534	06/30/2003	Zecv Likwornik	Q73193	8254

23373 7590 10/04/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

TIEU, BINH KIEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,534	LIKWORNIK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	/BINH K. TIEU/	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silver et al. (US. Pat. #: 7,035,393) in view of Kobashikawa et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0186848).

Regarding claim 1, Silver et al. ("Silver") teaches a method for populating an electronic address book, said method comprising:

analyzing information stored in a billing database or call data record (i.e., database 130 as shown in figure 1, col.3, lines 12-14; lines 58-63; and col.4, lines 16-24);

extracting at least one telephone number from the billing database or the call data record if at least some of the information stored in the billing database or call detail record (col.4, lines 45-60); and

adding the extracted at least one telephone number to the electronic address book (col.6, lines 3-30).

It should be noticed that Silver fails to clearly teach the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user. However, Kobashikawa et al. ("Kobashikawa") teaches an apparatus, system and method for use in generating and maintaining an electronic address book that comprises the feature of allowing a user to electronically select and setup criteria for

updating his or her electronic address book (see paragraphs [0038]-[0039]) for a purpose of limiting addition of addresses into the user's address book.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user, as taught by Kobashikawa, into view of Silver in order to limit addition of addresses into the user's address book.

Regarding claim 2, Silver further teaches limitations of the claim in col.6, lines 45-55.

Regarding claims 3-5, Kobashikawa further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0042] and [0046].

Regarding claims 6-12, Silver further teaches limitations of the claims in col.5, line 1 through col.7, line 9.

Regarding claims 13-14, Silver and Kobashikawa teach the provisioning extracted contact information in a form of signal transmission and displaying the contact information to user. It is also known that other type of transmissions and presentation of contact information such as in a form of synthesized speech and SMS message, etc. are obviously implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a form of synthesized speech and SMS message in the well-known techniques into view of Silver and Kobashikawa in order to improve the provision of contact information to the user.

Regarding claims 15-19, Kobashikawa further teaches obviously limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0032] and [0039]-[0043].

Regarding claims 20-22, Silver further teaches obviously limitations of the claims in col.7, lines 10-20.

Regarding claim 23, Silver teaches a system for populating an electronic address book, comprising:

an analyzing unit which analyzes information stored in a billing database or call data record (i.e., database 130 as shown in figure 1, col.3, lines 12-14; lines 58-63; and col.4, lines 16-24);

an extracting unit which extracts at least one telephone number from the billing database or the call data record if at least some of the information stored in the billing database or call detail record (col.4, lines 45-60); and

a transferring unit which adds the extracted at least one telephone number to the electronic address book (col.6, lines 3-30).

It should be noticed that Silver fails to clearly teach the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user. However, Kobashikawa et al. ("Kobashikawa") teaches an apparatus, system and method for use in generating and maintaining an electronic address book that comprises the feature of allowing a user to electronically select and setup criteria for updating his or her electronic address book (see paragraphs [0038]-[0039]) for a purpose of limiting addition of addresses into the user's address book.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user, as taught by Kobashikawa, into view of Silver in order to limit addition of addresses into the user's address book.

Regarding claim 24, Silver further teaches limitations of the claim in col.6, lines 45-55.

Regarding claims 25-27, Kobashikawa further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0042] and [0046].

Regarding claims 28-34, Silver further teaches limitations of the claims in col.5, line 1 through col.7, line 9.

Regarding claims 35-36, Silver and Kobashikawa teach the provisioning extracted contact information in a form of signal transmission and displaying the contact information to user. It is also known that other type of transmissions and presentation of contact information such as in a form of synthesized speech and SMS message, etc. are obviously implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a form of synthesized speech and SMS message in the well-known techniques into view of Silver and Kobashikawa in order to improve the provision of contact information to the user.

Regarding claims 37-43, Kobashikawa further teaches obviously limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0032] and [0039]-[0043].

Regarding claims 20-22, Silver further teaches obviously limitations of the claims in col.7, lines 10-20.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tafoya et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,952,805) also teaches a system and method for automatically populating a dynamic contact information list.

Art Unit: 2614

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand Carry Deliveries to:

Customer Service Window
(Randolph Building)
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: September 2007